

## REMARKS

Reconsideration is requested for claims 13-26. Favorable action is requested for new claims 27-31.

Initially, the undersigned wishes to thank Examiner Wendell for his time, attention, and consideration during the interview that was conducted at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on July 16, 2008, in connection with the present application.

Claims 20-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. It is respectfully submitted that the claims are not indefinite. Claim 20 recites that the actuator is disposed substantially inside the locking means. An embodiment of this is illustrated in FIGS. 5-6. The specification has been amended to clarify that an embodiment of the actuator is identified by reference numeral 30.

Claim 21 recites that the actuator device is disposed substantially outside the locking means, and claim 22 recites that the actuator device is disposed in the carrier element. The original specification, at Page 9, lines 13-16, discloses this subject matter. A proposed amended FIG. 1 is attached and shows an actuator device 30' in the carrier element. As is clear from the original specification, the purpose of the actuator device is simply to cause the spring 19 to withdraw into the locking means 12 and, thus, one skilled in the art would understand that the actuator device could be provided in a variety of locations. An actuator device 30' in the carrier element 1 is illustrated as a hole in the carrier element as the bulk of the device can be disposed inside the carrier element.

Claim 23 does not recite that an actuator element is provided in a particular location and it was agreed during the interview that the rejection of this claim was unintended.

It was agreed during the interview that claims 20-23 comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and withdrawal of the rejection is cordially urged.

Claims 13-15, 19, 21-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,372,354 to *Cacicedo*. Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,372,354 to *Cacicedo*. It was agreed during the interview that claim 13 and the claims dependent therefrom, claims 14-22, are not anticipated by and define patentably over *Cacicedo*.

Claims 16-18 depend from claim 13 and were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Cacicedo* in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,346,238 to *Dashio*. *Dashio* is cited as disclosing an insertion groove that is obliquely inclined downward. *Dashio* does not, however, cure the other defects of *Cacicedo* discussed above with regard to claim 13 and, accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13 and the claims dependent therefrom, including claims 16-18, define patentably over *Cacicedo* in view of *Dashio*.

Claims 23-26 were rejected as being anticipated by *Cacicedo*. It was agreed during the interview that *Cacicedo* does not anticipate claim 23, from which claims 24-26 depend.

It is respectfully submitted that new claims 27-31 define patentably over the cited art, as well.

To the extent that the applicant does not respond to a particular comment in the Official Action, the applicant does not intend by this to indicate acquiescence in or agreement with the comment. To the extent that any extensions of time are necessary in connection with this application it is requested that there be a standing petition for extension of time and that any

additional fees that are required, or refunds due, in connection with this or any other paper filed in connection with this application be charged to Deposit Account 503015.

If the Examiner should be of the opinion that a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned.

1217 King Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
(703) 299-0953

Date: July 16, 2008

Respectfully submitted,  
  
WHITE, REDWAY & BROWN LLP

By: /Harold R. Brown III/  
Harold R. Brown III  
Registration No. 36,341